<center>**REMARKS**</center>

Claims 1, 5-8, 10-12 and 14-16 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

<u>**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**</u>

Claims 1, 5-8, 10-12 and 14-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karp (US 2003/0061598) in view of Voas (U.S. Pat. No. 7,024,592). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's invention is directed to a technique for modifying the underlying functionality of an executable program. In particular, Applicant's invention provides a method and system for controlling the value of a parameter inside an executable program. For example, claim 10 recites an instruction locator that "selects a parameter of interest in the software program that is defined in random access memory associated with the software program and evaluates <u>each</u> machine instruction in the executable form of the software program to identify machine instructions that contain address information for the parameter" in combination with other claim elements. The Examiner's attention is also drawn to claim 11 which further defines this aspect of the present invention. In this way, Applicant's invention replaces each instruction in the program that accesses the parameter of interest with a branch instruction. The automated nature of this approach is not contemplated by the relied upon references. Pending claims have been amended to clarify this aspect of the present invention.

Basis for these amendments may be found in Figure 5 and accompany description of this figure.

Karp is directed generally to a computer system which provides hint instructions to a processor. As understood from Karp, hint instructions are instructions intended to optimize execution of other instructions in a program for a particular processor. As conceded by the Examiner, Karp does not teach using a set of relocated instructions to change a value of a variable. The Examiner relies upon Voas to teach this aspect of Applicant's claimed invention.

Voas relates generally to a method for assessing continuously operating software systems. To do so, Voas contemplates injecting data anomalies into the software. However, for any given test, a value of a variable is corrupted or changed only once. Thus, Voas is not concerned with evaluating each machine instruction in the executable form of the software program to identify machine instructions that contain address information for the parameter as recited in Applicant's claimed invention. It is also noteworthy that Voas does not appear to disclose a particular technique for how to inject faults into the software. There appears to be no teaching of a fault injection instruction as asserted by the Examiner. For at least these reason, Voas fails to remedy the deficiencies of Karp. Combining the teachings of Karp with Voas fails to yield Applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 2, 2009

By: /Timothy D. MacIntyre/
    Timothy D. MacIntyre
    Reg. No. 42824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

TDM/kev